

REMARKS

Claims 1-60, 66, and 68-81 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8, 19, 26, 59, 60, 70, 73 and 75 have been amended, with claims 8 and 26 being converted into independent form. Claims 1, 8, 19, 26, 38, 48, 59, 60, 66, 69, 70, 73, 75, and 77 are independent claims.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, 19, 24, 59-60, 63 and 70-72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the BGI in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,797 to Freeman *et al.* (hereinafter “Freeman”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed at the interview with the Examiner on October 21, 2008, neither the BGI nor Freeman teach or suggest a switch arrangement connected to a measurement channel for switching the measurement channel *“to sequentially measure a first voltage on a first side of said load component, and a voltage difference between said first side and a second side of said load component.”* This specific language was agreed upon at the interview, and independent claims 1, 19, 59, 60, 73, and 75 have been amended to incorporate this recitation. Thus, Applicant submits that these independent claims, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over BGI in view of Freeman, as agreed upon at the interview.

Independent claim 70, as amended, recites “an analog difference amplifier connected to said first end and a second end of said impedance component,” and “a switch connected to switch between said first end of said impedance component and an output of said analog difference amplifier.” As discussed at the interview, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed apparatus with an analog difference amplifier and a switch connected to an end of an impedance component and the output of the analog difference amplifier, as claimed. Thus, Applicant submits that that independent claim 70, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over BGI in view of Freeman, as agreed upon at the interview.

Claims 2-5, 7-8, 20-23 and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the BGI in view of Freeman and Slates. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed at the interview, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed apparatus with a processing means “adapted to generate [an] output as an indication of whether or not a factor related to the impedance or at least one component thereof is above or below a threshold without determining an absolute measure of impedance.” The recitation of “without determining an absolute measure of impedance” was discussed and agreed upon at the interview, and claims 8 and 26 (rewritten in independent form) have been amended to incorporate this recitation. Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 8 and 26, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over BGI in view of Freeman and Slates, as agreed upon at the interview.

The remaining independent claims, namely claims 38, 48, 66, 69 and 77, have been allowed. The claims that depend from these five independent claims are therefore also allowable.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No.: 31,063
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant